

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-27, 29, 31-41, 43-49, and 52-65 were pending and presented for examination. In an Office Action dated January 2, 2008, claims 1, 4-27, 29, 31-41, 43-49, and 52-65 were rejected. Applicants thank the Examiner for examination of the claims pending in this application and address the Examiner's comments below. Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections, and withdraw them.

Interview Summary

Applicants thank the Examiner for his time in conducting a telephone interview on March 26, 2008 with Applicants' representative Jennifer Bush and Matthew Harvey. During the telephone interview, Applicants' representative and the Examiner discussed claims 1 and 41, the Ito reference, and possible claim amendment language. An agreement was reached that Ito did not disclose a printer sending commands to a media source, which corresponded to a proposed amendment.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a)

In the 4th paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 16, 21, 24, 25, 41, 47, and 56-65 under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 ("Sugiyama"), U.S. Patent No. 5,987,226 ("Ishikawa"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,617,138 ("Ito"). This rejection now is traversed.

As amended, independent claims 1 and 41 respectively recite a printer and method comprising, *inter alia*, "a multimedia processing system within the printer ... for sending a

command to [a] media source to control the media source to transmit [] time-based media data to the printer.”

These aspects of the claimed invention are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, considered alone or in the combination proposed by the Examiner. As a preliminary matter, the Examiner admits that neither Sugiyama nor Ishikawa disclose a multimedia processing system within a printer controlling operation of a media source. Office Action dated January 2, 2008, p. 4 (“Office Action” herein).

Ito does not remedy the deficiencies of Sugiyama and Ishikawa. Ito merely describes a system control unit (FIG. 24 (16)) controlling a power supply unit (15) to start the supply of electric power (col. 12, l. 11) to units within the system and an external terminal connection detector unit (82) flipping a video input select changeover switch (81) to select between video from a video camera (11) and an external video input terminal (80). Neither controlling a power supply unit nor operating a switch to select between two potential video inputs comprise “**sending a command to [a] media source.**” Thus, Ito, alone or in the suggested combination with Sugiyama and Ishikawa, does not show at least this limitation of claims 1 and 41.

The deficient disclosures of these references, considered either alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, thus fail to establish even a *prima facie* basis from which a proper determination of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) can be made. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 41 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

Claims 16, 21, 24, 25, 47, and 56-68 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, which were shown above to be patentable over the cited references. In addition, these claims recite

additional features not shown in the cited references. For these reasons, Applicants submit that claims 16, 21, 24, 25, 47, and 56-68 also are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

In the 5th paragraph, claims 4-6 and 43-44 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent No. 6,193,658 B1 (“Wendelken”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 4-6 and 43-44 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, which were shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in the suggested combination. Wendelken does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Wendelken is cited merely to show generating a printed output on video paper, storing an electronic output on a media recorder, or storing an electronic output on a removable storage device. Even assuming *arguendo* that Wendelken shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Wendelken of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command to [a] media source to control the media source to transmit [] time-based media data to the printer**” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 4-6 and 43-44 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Wendelken, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 6th paragraph, claims 7 and 45 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Wendelken , U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0220988 A1 (“Hymel”), and US Patent Publication No. 2002/0185533 A1 (“Shieh”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 7 and 45 variously depend from claims 1 and 41. Applicants have shown above that claims 1 and 41 are patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Wendelken, alone or in the suggested combinations.

Neither Hymel nor Shieh, alone or together, remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Wendelken, nor does the Examiner assert they do. Rather, Hymel is cited merely to show that a removable storage device may be selected from a group consisting of a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a video tape and a computer disk and Shieh is cited merely to show that a removable storage device may be selected from a group consisting of a flash card and a memory stick. Even assuming *arguendo* that Hymel and Shieh show that which the Examiner cites them for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Hymel and Shieh of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command** to [a] media source **to control the media source to transmit** [] time-based media data to the printer” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 45 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Wendelken, Hymel, and Shieh, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 8th paragraph claims 9, 11-12, and 18 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Shieh. This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 9, 11-12 and 18 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Shieh. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 9, 11-12, and 18 also are patentable over these references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for the reasons discussed above.

In the 11th paragraph claims 15, 20, 22, 46, and 48 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Hymel. This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 15, 20, 22, 46 and 48 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Hymel. Thus, Applicants submit that

claims 15, 20, 22, 46, and 48 also are patentable over these references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for the reasons discussed above.

In the 7th paragraph claims 8 and 38-40 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 (“Chino”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 8 and 38-40 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in the suggested combination. Chino does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Chino is cited merely to show an interface comprising an ultrasonic pen capture device or a multimedia processing system comprising an image detection system, a face recognition system, or a speech recognition system. Even assuming *arguendo* that Chino shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Chino of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command** to [a] media source **to control the media source to transmit** [] time-based media data to the printer” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 8 and 38-40 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Chino, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 9th paragraph claim 10 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 (“Stevens”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 10 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in combination. Stevens does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather,

Stevens is cited merely to show an interface comprising a wireless communication interface. Even assuming *arguendo* that Stevens shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Stevens of “a multimedia processing system within the printer ... for **sending a command** to [a] media source **to control the media source to transmit** [] time-based media data to the printer” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 10 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Stevens, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 10th paragraph claims 13-14 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent No. 5,436,792 (“Leman”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 13-14 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinguishable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in combination. Leman does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Leman is cited merely to show an interface comprising a docking station, wherein the docking station is built into the printer. Even assuming *arguendo* that Leman shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Leman of “a multimedia processing system within the printer ... for **sending a command** to [a] media source **to control the media source to transmit** [] time-based media data to the printer” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 13-14 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Leman, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 12th paragraph claims 17, 29, and 33-35 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0048224 A1 (“Dygert”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claims 17, 29 and 33-35 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in combination. Dygert does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Dygert is cited merely to show an interface comprising a port for connecting a peripheral device, the port selected from a group consisting of SCSI, IDE, RJ11, composite, a multimedia processing system that communicates with a media source (the multimedia processing system not being within a printer and not sending commands to control the media source), or an interface comprising a database server, wherein the database server comprises a music catalog or a video database. Even assuming *arguendo* that Dygert shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Dygert of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command to [a] media source to control the media source to transmit [] time-based media data to the printer**” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 17, 29 and 33-35 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Dygert, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 13th paragraph claim 19 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Shieh, Hymel, and U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 (“Gerber”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 19 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Shieh, and Hymel, alone or in the suggested combinations. Gerber does not

remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Shieh, and Hymel, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Gerber is cited merely to show a removable storage reader comprising a media reader selected from a group consisting of a DVD reader, a flash card reader, a memory stick reader, a CD reader, a computer disk reader, and an SD reader. Even assuming *arguendo* that Gerber shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Gerber of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command to [a] media source to control the media source to transmit [] time-based media data to the printer**” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Hymel, Shieh, and Gerber, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 14th paragraph claims 23 and 49 are rejected as being allegedly unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Shieh, Hymel, and U.S. Patent No.4,881,135 (“Heilweil”). This rejection is traversed.

Claims 23 and 49 variously depend from claims 1 and 41, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Shieh, and Hymel, alone or in the suggested combinations. Heilweil does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Shieh, and Hymel, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Heilweil is cited merely to show a media source comprising a media input device selected from a group consisting of a DVD reader, a video cassette tape reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a flash card reader, a digital video recorder, a video capture device, and a meeting recorder. Even assuming *arguendo* that Heilweil shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Heilweil of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command to [a] media source to control the media source to transmit [] time-based media data to the printer**” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 19 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Hymel, Shieh, and Gerber, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

media data to the printer” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 23 and 49 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Hymel, Shieh, and Heilweil, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 15th paragraph claim 26 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent No. 4,807,186 (“Ohnishi”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 26 depends directly from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in combination. Ohnishi does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Ohnishi is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system generating a bar code, the bar code corresponding to a video segment in the video stream. Even assuming *arguendo* that Ohnishi shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Ohnishi of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command to [a] media source to control the media source to transmit [] time-based media data to the printer**” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 26 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Ohnishi, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 16th paragraph claim 27 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Huberman (US Patent 6,115,718). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 27 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in the suggested combinations. Huberman does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Huberman is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system configured to

generate a web page representation of multimedia. Even assuming *arguendo* that Huberman shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Huberman of “a multimedia processing system within the printer … for **sending a command to [a] media source to control the media source to transmit** [] time-based media data to the printer” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 27 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Huberman, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 18th paragraph claim 36 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Dygert, and Huberman. This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 36 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, Dygert, and Huberman. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 36 also is patentable over these references, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, for the reasons discussed above.

In the 17th paragraph claims 31-32 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0169849 (“Schroath”). This rejection is traversed.

Claims 31-32 depend from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in the suggested combinations. Schroath does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Schroath is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system configured to automatically detect a communicative coupling of a media source or to automatically download multimedia data from the media source. Even assuming *arguendo* that Schroath shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Schroath of “a

multimedia processing system within the printer ... for **sending a command** to [a] media source **to control the media source to transmit** [] time-based media data to the printer” as claimed.

Thus, Applicants submit that claims 31-32 are patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Schroath, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of their dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 19th paragraph claim 37 is rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent No. 4,754,485 (“Klatt”). This rejection now is traversed.

Claim 37 depends from claim 1, shown above to be patentably distinct over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, alone or in the suggested combinations. Klatt does not remedy the above-stated deficiencies of Sugiyama, Ishikawa, and Ito, nor does the Examiner assert that it does. Rather, Klatt is cited merely to show a multimedia processing system comprising a text-to-speech system. Even assuming *arguendo* that Klatt shows that which the Examiner cites it for, Applicants can find no disclosure or suggestion in Klatt of “a multimedia processing system within the printer ... for **sending a command** to [a] media source **to control the media source to transmit** [] time-based media data to the printer” as claimed. Thus, Applicants submit that claim 37 is patentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and Klatt, alone or in the combination suggested by the Examiner, by reason of its dependency and the further limitations recited therein.

In the 20th paragraph claims 52-55 are rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama, Ishikawa, Ito, and U.S. Patent No. 5,432,532 (“Mochimaru”). Claims 52-55 are cancelled.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 4-27, 29, 31-41, 43-49, and 56-68, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
PETER E. HART, ET AL.

Dated: April 2, 2008

By: Jennifer R. Bush/

Jennifer R. Bush, Reg. No. 50,784
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7213
Fax: (650) 938-5200